A
232
M17

THE

ROOT AND OFFSPRING OF DAVID,

OR, THE

SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE

REGARDING THE

CONSTITUTION OF THE REDEEMER'S PERSON.

BY THE

REV. WALTER M'GILVRAY, D.D.

AUTHOR OF "LECTURES ON JUDE," "THE DEAD QUICKENED," "PEACE IN BELIEVING," &c.

MONTREAL:

PRINTED BY J. C. BECKET, 211½ ST. PAUL STREET.

MDCCCXLVIII.

THE

ROOT AND OFFSPRING OF DAVID,

OR, THE

SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE

CONCERNING THE

CONSTITUTION OF THE REDEEMER'S PERSON.

BY THE

Rev. WALTER MCILVAINE, D.D.

AUTHOR OF "LECTURES ON JUDE," & "THE DEAD CHURCHES," & "FAITH IN SUFFERING," &c.

MONTREAL:

PRINTED BY J. C. BECKET, 144 ST. PAUL STREET.

MDCCCXLVIII.

PREFACE.

The following Discourse having been delivered in Gabriel Street Church, Montreal, the preacher was requested to furnish a copy for the press, by certain friends who were present on the occasion. Hoping it may in some measure answer the expectations of these friends, by helping to disseminate sound views regarding the Constitution of the Redeemer's Person, the sermon is, with much pleasure, placed at their disposal, by one who desires to "count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus *the Lord.*"

21276

THE

ROOT AND OFFSPRING OF DAVID;

OR, THE

SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE

REGARDING THE

CONSTITUTION OF THE REDEEMER'S PERSON.

MATTHEW XXII. 41—46.

"While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? And no man was able to answer him a word; neither durst any man, from that day forth, ask him any more questions.

In this passage it is stated that when the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?" to which they answered, "The son of David;" and their reply, so far as it went, was correct. But

although it was the truth, it was yet not the *whole* truth ; and our Lord, with a view to convince them of this, followed up his first question by a second, " How then doth David, in spirit, call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool. If David then call him LORD, how is he his son ?" And the Evangelist tells us, that "No man was able to answer him a word."

From this it appears that the Pharisees, with all their pretensions to Scriptural knowledge, were ignorant of the real character of the Messiah. They did not seem to comprehend how he could at the same time be David's son and David's Lord, or, in other words, they did not understand the constitution of his person as *Emmanuel—God with us.* And yet if they had studied their own prophecies aright, they could not have failed to perceive that the representations there given of him, corresponded in all respects with the statements of the Psalmist.

For there he is sometimes spoken of as "a child," and yet as the "mighty God;" as "a son," and yet as "the everlasting Father." In one place he is represented as a servant, acting in an inferior and subordinate capacity; in another as the supreme Creator, and the sovereign proprietor of all things. In many passages he is brought before us an object of compassion, bruised, buffetted, rejected and despised; in others, he is set forth as the centre of universal homage, with kings and rulers kneeling at his footstool, and nations hastening to acknowledge his sway. From these contrasted accounts of the Messiah's character, we see how truly the spirit of propheey delineated the mystery of His person, and how remarkably the great truth, which confounded the wisdom of the Pharisees, is confirmed by those "holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

With the view of unfolding this subject more fully, we shall first endeavour to prove

that Christ is David's Lord: In the second place, that he is also David's son; and in the last place we shall go on to show how clearly both these parts of his person, his Humanity, and his Divinity, develop themselves in the facts and circumstances of his life. Consider what we say, and may the Lord give you understanding in all things.

In proceeding to prove that Christ is David's Lord, we would observe that there are four parties who may be considered as primarily concerned in this question, and whose testimony should be sufficient to decide it. These are, God the Father; Christ himself; his disciples on the one hand, and his enemies on the other. Should we find the whole of the parties now mentioned concurring in their testimony, we presume that their evidence may be regarded as conclusive.

1. Appealing, then, to the testimony of *God the Father*, what does he say regarding the point before us? Without citing the various

places in which the Divinity of the Messiah is either distinctly assumed, or expressly asserted by the Old Testament writers, we shall content ourselves by simply referring to one or two passages in which the Father is represented as recognizing, directly and personally, the co-equality of the Son. In the prophecies of Zechariah* we find the first person in the Godhead speaking on this wise, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man that is *my fellow*, (*or compeer*,) saith the Lord of Hosts." And in a passage quoted by the Apostle from the Book of Psalms, "the Father saith unto the Son, thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." † Now, we are told that Jehovah is "a jealous God," and that "he will not give his glory to another;" and we may therefore feel perfectly sure, that if Christ were not a Divine being, he would not permit

*13th Chapter, 7th verse.
† Compare Ps. 45—61, with Heb. 1—8.

such declarations as these to be entered on the record in His name.

2. But the second party of whom we have spoken as interested in this matter is *Christ Himself*, and what testimony did he give on the subject? The passage which stands as our text plainly indicates the light in which he intended this question to be viewed. Had He been merely a man, why should he have objected to the statement made by the Pharisees? Was it not the fact that He was David's son, that He was sprung from the root of Jesse? This was clearly and undoubtedly the case, and if he was nothing more than man, the objection that He took to the answers of the Pharisees, and the quotations which He adduced from the writings of the Psalmist to prove that He was David's Lord, were only fitted to lead to confusion, or rather to manifest deception. But this is not the only place in which claims of a similar nature are advanced by Him.

There are several passages in which He

speaks of himself as a Divine being, and asserts his identity and equality with God:

"I and my Father, (says he,) are one." *

"My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." †

"He that hath seen ME, hath seen the Father." ‡

Just think of any human being venturing to use such language! Were the most exalted individual that ever bore the human form to say in our presence, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father," would we not instantly pronounce him to be a blasphemer or a madman? If Christ, however, bore this record of himself, we see not how even the deniers of His Divinity can get rid of the conclusion which his language involves. For although they may persist in maintaining that Christ was a mere man, they still admit that he was a perfect man, and therefore incapable of stating an untruth, or of encouraging the

* John 10—30. † John 5—17. ‡ John 14—9.

slightest approach to imposition or delusion. And yet to say in the face of His own distinct and decisive declarations that He was nothing more than man, is to convict Him of the deepest and the deadliest of all sins —the sin that hurled the ruined angels from Heaven—the sin that brought misery and wrath upon the human race—the sin, in short, to which all the evil in the universe is to be primarily traced—the sin of *aspiring to an equality with God.* If Christ was but a man, then we maintain that he was not even an honest man; for no honest man would thus assert his claim to Divine honours so directly and unequivocally as He does. No mere creature could ever, without the most impious presumption, say of himself, under any possible circumstances, or in any conceivable sense, "*I* and my *Father* are *One!*"

3. But, besides his own testimony, we appeal to that of *His disciples.* No one can doubt that they were competent witnesses in such a case as this. They knew

their master well. They were with Him, both in public and private, and must have been thoroughly acquainted with the views which he entertained regarding His own character. The relation in which they stood to Him, and the manner in which He acted towards them, must, independently of His own direct statements, have forced every moment upon their minds, the exact nature of the position which He sustained amongst them. If familiar intimacy be fatal to unfounded pretensions, its verdict is all the more conclusive when it is given in favour of real and rightful claims. Then what did his disciples think of Christ? Did they believe Him to be the Son of God? On one occasion our Lord put the question to them himself—"Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" The disciples answered, "Some say that thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, and others, Jeremias, or one of the Prophets." After thus hearing the conflicting views of the multitude concerning Him, he wished to know their own senti-

ments on the subject: "But whom say *ye* that I am?" And Simon Peter answered and said—"*Thou art the Christ—the Son of the living God!*"

Now, mark the manner in which our Lord received this answer—"Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven." * What! would not "flesh and blood," or—which means the same thing—would not his own common sense and natural perception have been sufficient to convince Peter that Christ was a man, if his answer was intended to convey nothing more? Did it need a special revelation from Heaven to assure him of such a simple, unmistakable fact? The confession of the Apostle, therefore, and the comment which our Lord made upon it, are utterly incapable of any rational interpretation, except on the understanding that the words imply what they plainly intimate,

---

* Matthew xvi. 13, 17.

viz., that Peter declared Christ to be a Divine person; and for rightly apprehending this supernatural truth, the Apostle must have been indebted to supernatural aid, for "no man can say that Jesus is the Christ, but by the Holy Ghost."

But among many testimonies to the same effect, which might be collected from the sayings and doings of the Apostles, we shall confine ourselves to one other, which will be sufficient to confirm the statement already adduced. The instance to which we refer is to be found in the case of Stephen, the first of the Gospel martyrs.

We read of him that he was "a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost;" and when he was led forth to be stoned for adhering to the faith, we are told that "looking steadfastly up to Heaven, he saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God." His enemies, enraged at the holy rapture with which this heavenly vision inspired the bosom of the triumphant saint, ran upon him with one accord,

and "stoned him—*calling upon God*, and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit." * Now, it is very remarkable that when the Father and the Son were both present to his view at the same time, he should have called upon the second rather than the first, and have commended his soul to the Son instead of commending it to the Father. If Christ be only a man—a mere creature—to invoke Him at all would have been idolatry; to invoke Him in preference to Jehovah would have been the most direct and daring impiety; to invoke Him in the very article of death—at the very moment when he was about to appear in the presence of the supreme Judge, would have been the perfect climax and consummation of blasphemy. But is it possible—is it credible that a good man, full of the Holy Ghost, should have been guilty of this sin? and guilty, too, at the very time when he was laying down his life as a martyr for

* Acts vii. 55—59.

the truth? It is clearly incredible—it is quite impossible; and the conduct of Stephen, therefore, at this solemn and momentous crisis, proves how thoroughly and confidently the disciples believed the Divinity of Christ.

4. But in further confirmation of this doctrine we appeal finally to the testimony of *His enemies*. Of course, they denied that he was a Divine person; but it is not with the view of ascertaining their own belief in regard to this point that we refer to them: we know too well what they "thought of Christ." The question on which we appeal to their evidence is this, viz.: whether they understood our Lord to assert his right to the honours of Divinity?—whether they had any certain grounds for supposing that *he regarded himself* as a Divine person? Their opposition to him turned mainly on this precise question. He said he was the Christ—the Messiah promised to the fathers. In accordance with the whole tenor of the

prophecies, he further asserted that the Messiah was to possess the nature of God, so as to be essentially one with Jehovah. They refused to believe that he was the Christ, and they affected to be greatly shocked at the idea of his claiming equality with God. We are told that on one occasion "they took up stones to stone him because he said he was the Son of God, making himself equal to God."* In this passage you will observe that the Jews considered Christ as making himself "*equal to God*," because "he said he was the *Son of God*;" or in other words, they understood the Son to be equal with the Father. They did not draw those nice distinctions that certain parties are accustomed to make; they did not say that to call himself the Son of God was a different thing from his claiming to be very God. On the contrary, they rightly regarded the one as inferring, and necessarily comprehending the other;

* John v. 18.

and hence when he said he was the Son of God, they immediately charged him with making himself *equal to God*. It is true that the title now mentioned does not always imply equality with God. Angels, for example, are called the Sons of God, and accordingly we read, that when the work of creation was completed, "the morning stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for joy." Believers are also called the Sons of God: "Behold (says John) what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the Sons of God." But Christ is not the Son of God in either the one or the other of the senses in which the name is here used. He is not, like the angels, his Son by *creation*, for he was never made: neither is he, like believers, his Son by *adoption*, for he was never an alien; but he is his Son in a high, and divine, and ineffable sense; a sense in which it is said of him that he is God's "*own*" Son, God's "*only*" Son; a sense which implies a mutual par-

ticipation of essence, power, and glory ;— so his Son, that the Son can say of the Father, as we have seen, "I and my Father are one ;" and that the Father can say of the Son, "thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." It was because he called himself the Son of God in this distinct and pre-eminent meaning of the term that the Jews regarded him as asserting essential identity with God, and that they therefore proposed to stone him to death as an open and convicted blasphemer.

But there is another instance in which the conduct of his enemies serves to throw still clearer light upon this point. The proof to which we now refer arose from the circumstances connected with his last trial. He was arraigned, as the sacred historians inform us, on two separate charges, the one civil, the other ecclesiastical. For the first of these he was tried before the civil tribunal of Pilate. He was ac-

cused of sedition, and witnesses were examined with the view of proving that he had inculcated treasonable doctrines, and entertained the design of overthrowing the authority of Cæsar, and having himself proclaimed "king of the Jews." After full investigation, however, it was found that this charge could not be proved, that the kingdom which he spoke of establishing was a spiritual empire—a kingdom not of this world, and therefore a kind of sovereignty that involved no rebellion against the civil rule of Cæsar. The Judge, perceiving the fallacy on which the accusation rested, was compelled to acquit him, and to declare, in the face of his disappointed and infuriated enemies, "that he found no fault in him." Determined, however, to compass his destruction, they charged him with the sin of blasphemy, and had him arraigned before the Sanhedrim, the Supreme ecclesiastical Court of the Jewish Church. When the case came on for trial, it appears that

the witnesses for the prosecution, "did not agree" among themselves; their evidence was so confused and contradictory that nothing could be made of it, and the malice of his persecutors was about to be defeated here again. But his judges, who were the secret instigators of all the proceedings against him, being anxious, if possible, to discover some ground of conviction on which to condemn him, resolved at last to appeal to the testimony of the accused himself. Putting him, therefore, upon oath, the President of the Court said to the prisoner at the bar, "I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ the Son of God." What was the reply? Life or death depended on the answer that might be returned. "And Jesus said, *I am.*"* Whereupon the High Priest, to express his abhorrence of the presumption and profanation of which he supposed him to be guilty, "rent his

* Mark xiv. 62.

clothes," and exclaimed, "What need we any further witnesses? ye have heard the blasphemy—what think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death." Now, was there any mistake here? Did Christ really mean to assert that he was the Son of God, which, as we have already seen, the Jews regarded as expressing equality with God? Did our Lord on this solemn and critical occasion intend to maintain this point—to affirm this distinct, decisive, and all important fact? If not, why did he allow any doubt to rest upon the matter? Why did he not attempt to explain his statement, and to tell the Court that his answer was misunderstood? that he did not mean to say he was the Son of God in the Divine sense which they attached to the title, that he only used that sacred name in an inferior and subordinate sense. Had there been any actual misunderstanding of this kind, can we suppose that our Lord would not have instantly interfered to correct it? Most assuredly he

would. His duty to God, his duty to himself, his duty to his cause, and followers, and even his duty to his accusers and persecutors, all required that he should. The circumstance, therefore, of his offering no explanation is a proof that there was no mistake, that his meaning was correctly understood, and that he did intend to affirm distinctly and unequivocally that he was a Divine person. For this confession it was that he was put to death. Pilate acquitted him, as we have seen, but the Jews said, "we have a law, and by our law he should die;" and it was by their law, pronounced in the Council of the Sanhedrim, that he was condemned; and the charge on which his condemnation rested—a charge which he himself expressly admitted, and the only charge that was really proved against him, was that he maintained he was "*The Christ, the Son of the living God.*"

To deny the Divinity of Christ, therefore, is to deny the very doctrine for which

he died. The Socinians, disowning him as a Mediator, speak of him simply as a martyr, while, with the most marvellous inconsistency, they reject the great truth for which he was condemned to suffer. They leave him a martyr without a testimony. But it was not so. The stone which these builders have rejected, the same has become the head of the corner. "Whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken, but upon whomsoever it shall fall, it shall grind him to powder."

The evidence which we have thus adduced in proof of this cardinal doctrine of Christianity, lies, as you will observe, on the very surface of the record. It forms but a mere fractional part of the evidence which the Scriptures furnish in reference to this vital point. We have, however, purposely abstained from taking a wider scope, conceiving, as we do, that one argument, provided it be sufficient, is as good as a thousand, while at the same time it is much more likely to be accurately marked

and distinctly remembered. A large accumulation of passages has generally the effect of fatiguing the attention, breaking the line of thought, and leading to scattered inferences and unsatisfactory conclusions. The proofs we have brought forward are so simple that the most unlearned can understand them, and yet we think sufficiently conclusive to satisfy the mind of any candid inquirer.

II. Having thus proved that Christ is "David's Lord," let us now turn to the second point suggested by the passage before us, and show how he is also "David's Son." Nor is there any occasion to detain you long with the discussion of this point, for there are comparatively few to be found, in these times at least, who have any doubt regarding the actual Humanity of Christ. It is, however, possible, that there may be some who do not *realize* this part of his personal constitution so clearly and closely as they should. We are inclined to think

that there are certain classes of professed Christians who fix their regards so entirely on the Divine character and perfections of the Redeemer, as to lose sight, in a great measure, of his human nature, with all the interesting and vitally important considerations connected therewith. Of such it may be said that they have no accurate conception of Emmanuel's person, and that the being of whom they think, when they direct their contemplations towards the Mediator of the New Covenant, is not the Christ of God, but an imaginary Christ of their own. If the Unitarian nullifies the scripture character of the Redeemer by denying his Divinity, those to whom we now refer nullify it almost as much by leaving habitually out of view his true and proper Humanity. It is therefore not unimportant that this branch of our subject should be brought under your notice as well as the other, although it does not call for the same amount of examination, in consequence of there being little or no

disposition on the part of Bible readers to dispute the doctrine that is commonly held in reference to it. All that is necessary, therefore, is simply to state that doctrine as it is laid down in the Divine word. And in order to connect this topic more closely with that which we have just been discussing, we shall select a passage in which the two seem to be purposely combined, and immediately contrasted, as if with the express design of their throwing the strongest light, the one upon the other. The passage to which we allude is to be found in the ninth chapter of Isaiah's prophecies, at the sixth verse, where we read as follows :—"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be on his shoulder ; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace." Here the Messiah is described both by his personal characteristics and by his official titles. The terms "Counsellor," and "Prince of Peace" are, we

need hardly observe, *official* designations; and the epithet "Wonderful," is clearly designed to express the rare and pre-eminent qualities pertaining to his Mediatorial character generally. Hence the *personal* terms by which he is described are, "the child born," "the son given," "the Mighty God," and "the everlasting Father;" and these, taken together, furnish us with a very remarkable proof of his twofold natures, as God and man—a proof that is far more pregnant and conclusive than it at first sight appears.

1. With regard, first of all, to his Manhood, it is declared that he is "born." He was not, like Adam, created at once out of the dust of the earth; neither was he, like Eve, formed out of the substance of another human being, by the direct interposition of God; but he was conceived in the womb, and carried in the womb, and came forth from the womb of an earthly mother. There cannot be a plainer proof of real and unquestionable humanity,

than the fact of his being *born*, and "born of a woman." But it is stated further:

2. That he was born "a child." To us *a child* is born" He did not come into this world with all his powers of body and mind completely matured and developed.* On the contrary, he appeared in the form and in all the feebleness of infant Humanity. Like any other child he was "wrapped in swaddling bands," and laid in a cradle, though that cradle was but a manger. And from all that we read of the childhood of Christ, we have no reason to suppose that it was marked by any peculiarities inconsistent with that period of life. We have rather every reason to believe that when he was a child he thought as a child, and spake as a child, and acted as a child, until in the course of time he came to "put away childish things." The state-

* It may suggest an illustrative thought in connection with this point, if we remind the reader of the ancient Great fable which relates that the goddess Minerva sprang full-armed from the head of Jove.

ment of the Evangelist plainly proves this, for he declares of him that "he *grew* in wisdom, and in stature," language referring both to his intellectual and physical development, and which directly implies that he passed through the usual and gradual progress by which childhood and youth mount up, and merge into manhood. We have therefore another proof of his Humanity in his being born a child, and thus becoming manifest in the flesh after the usual manner of men. But it is mentioned yet further:

3. That he was given as a son—"to us *a son* is given:" not a stranger, not a foreigner, but a genuine son of man, is here given to men; for such is evidently the meaning of the prophet's words. To bring out their full significance, it may perhaps be necessary to give you a brief illustration. We have all read or heard, in the tales of superstition, of infants being taken away by a certain class of unearthly beings, and other infants bearing a re-

semblance to them, but not belonging to this world, being left in their place; which infants, as they grew up, manifested by their singular peculiarities, their strange and uncongenial dispositions, that though they wore the human form, they had no real connection with the human race. But the case was far otherwise with the "holy child Jesus." He not only became partaker of flesh and blood, but he was made "in *all* respects like unto his brethren;" and showed himself to be possessed of all the essential features, even down to the physical weaknesses, and sinless infirmities peculiar to the nature which he assumed. Had there been any thing about him that was alien from the spirit of humanity, the disciples would not have treated or trusted him as they did. Men naturally recoil from beings not of their own species. They are startled by even the fancied approach of such beings, and so far from consenting to hold any communion with them, all the superstitious instincts of their

nature are quickened into keenest alarm, by the bare idea of being in their neighbourhood. We may, therefore, feel assured, that if there had been anything in the conduct or spirit of Christ that was at variance with the intrinsic qualities of human nature, the disciples would not have cherished towards him the entire confidence and familiar affection which they so uniformly displayed. John would not have leant on his bosom with such fearless love, nor would little children (the sharpest, because the most natural of all observers), after looking into his eyes, have gone into his arms to receive his blessing. Here, then, we find the best proof, and also the most complete one, of the undoubted Humanity of Christ.

Now, look for a moment at the contrast which the language of the prophet presents. "A child;" who is this child?—"the Mighty God!" "A Son;" who is this Son?—"The everlasting Father!" *This* is the most extreme and extraordinary con-

trast that ever came within the range of human thought. "A child" represents the lowest class of rational creatures that we are acquainted with, and represents that class at its lowest point of rationality. There are, as we have reason to believe, many classes of intelligent beings above us, but there is none, so far as we know, below us. And yet this child—this least and lowest of all rational creatures is declared to be not only "God," but as if to make the contrast as complete as is conceivable, or possible, the child is "*the Mighty God!*"

Again, "a son" intimates descent from a previous parentage; it speaks of one who has had a beginning, and who may therefore have an end; but "yet" this son is declared to be not only the "Father," but "*the everlasting Father!*" This is as transcendant a contrast in respect of *time*, as the other is in respect of *position*. If a child and the Mighty God combines the lowest with the loftiest of all intelligent

beings, a son and the everlasting Father connects the nursling of time with the Ancient of Days. This union of natures and qualities in the person of Christ is confessedly the greatest wonder in the universe of God; it is the most stupendous and astonishing of all heaven's miracles; it is, in short, the mystery of mysteries. Reason attempts in vain to realize it. Imagination, with all her strength of wing, flutters far, far beneath it. Faith alone, is able to look into these things, with any thing like a clear and penetrating vision, and even faith, which "knows what passeth knowledge," is compelled to exclaim, "without controversy great is the mystery of godliness—God manifest in the flesh!"

III. But we now pass on to the last point suggested by the subject before us, and that is to show you how these two parts of the Redeemer's person, his Humanity, and his Divinity, are found developed in the facts and circumstances of his life;

and when we have done this, the great truth which we are considering will be brought forth, not only in a doctrinal, but also in a practical form; it will be proved, not merely by a process of abstract discussion, but in the more simple and satisfactory shape of historical illustration. Besides laying before you what the sacred writers *thought* of Christ, we shall endeavour to show you how the twofold natures of Christ came out, displayed, and spoke for themselves in the course of his earthly history. We find an example to our purpose in the very first scene of his life:

1. The Evangelists inform us that, at the time when Jesus was born, Joseph and Mary had just arrived at the village of Bethlehem, where they inquired for accommodation at the inn; but the house being filled with guests that were presumed to be of greater importance, this humble looking couple were denied admission, and were compelled to seek shelter for them-

selves in the stable; and there, amid circumstances of the most unfeeling neglect, and destitute of every comfort that her peculiar situation required, was Mary delivered of her "wonderful" child. Nay, so poor and friendless was she, that she had not even the accommodation of a cradle for her precious infant, but was obliged to lay in a manger the Maker of the world. Thus, on his very first entrance into life, our Lord met with a specimen of the treatment to which he was afterwards so constantly and painfully exposed. As if meaner than the meanest of human kind, he was shut out from the houses, and from the hearts of men, and compelled to draw his first breath—*with the beasts of the field!* The Son of the Highest, so far from being born in a kingly palace, or in a stately mansion, or in a human habitation of any kind, however humble, was born in a stable. Had he seen the light but in the hut of a peasant, or in a beggar's hovel, he had not stood alone as he does in the hu-

miliation of his lot. And yet while he lay in his manger-cradle, neglected and despised by all around him, we read that a new star appeared, to guide Eastern sages to the place of his abode; and that a choir of angels broke out by night into strains of enraptured melody, and made the valleys ring with their songs of joy, celebrating the birth of that infant as the most illustrious event that ever signalised the annals of this world;—an event which secured "glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and good will among men." Mark the contrast that meets us here again: *There* is the stable,—and *there* is the star! *There* is the lowing of the oxen,—and *there* is the music of the angels! *There* are the menials of the inn despising,—and *there* are the wise men of the East worshipping!

2. That you may perceive the point before us yet more clearly, let me give you another illustration. You all doubtless, remember the "stilling of the storm," one

of the most signal and memorable of our Lord's miracles. We are told that on one occasion he entered into a fishing boat along with his disciples, with the view of crossing over to the other side of the sea of Galilee. Fatigued by his previous labours in preaching the Gospel of the kingdom, he no sooner stepped into the vessel than he fell asleep. What a touching comment on his own touching statement did his condition at that moment furnish. "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head."

How affecting to think that he who lay in the Father's bosom from all eternity should be contented to make his bed in such a place, with nothing under him but the hard wet boards of a fishing boat, nothing over him but the damp clouds of the sky. While he slept, a sudden tempest arose, and the disciples, becoming alarmed for their safety, resolved to awake him. Going up to him for that purpose, they

found him wrapped in the folds of slumber, unconscious of the storm that raged around him, and only rocked into deeper repose by the swell of the rising waves. Now, there is no condition in which a human being is so helpless as when he thus lies prostrate under the influence of sleep, with his eyes closed, his frame relaxed, his mind off its guard, all his defences gone. There, then, lay "David's Son;" there lay the "child born," reduced to the last and lowest point of human weakness. But lo! he awakes; he rises up in the boat; and, clearing the mists of slumber from his eyes, he looks forth with streaming hair through the thick clouds of the storm, and with a voice of authority he cries out—"*Peace—be still!*" That cry pierced the welkin like a sword; passed up through the rack of the tempest; the startled winds carried it away, as they fled in breathless confusion along the sky: through the tumultuous regions of the air the summons resounded, "Peace—be still!"—"*and immediately*

there was a great calm." Just look how the contrast which we have been attempting to trace comes out here again, and comes out, like the former, a contrast of extremes; for it is not merely the Humanity and Divinity of Christ that we see displayed, but we find these developed in the most forcible and emphatic of all possible ways; we find the weakness of the former, and the omnipotence of the latter, lying, as it were, side by side; or, in other words, we find the mightiest energies of the Godhead springing forth from amidst the feeblest elements connected with the nature of man. Here we have not only David's Son, and David's Lord, but we have "the Child" and "the mighty God;" we have the Least and the Greatest—the Lowest and the Loftiest!

3. But, ere we close, we shall adduce one other example from Scripture history, in proof of the principle before us. This example, also, we draw from one of the most affecting and sublime of our Lord's

miracles—the resurrection of Lazarus from the dead. At the time when Lazarus died, Christ was at a distance from Bethany; but knowing in his own spirit what had taken place, he announced the event to his disciples in these gentle and beautiful words—"Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may awake him out of sleep." The language which he employs to describe the decease of the good man befor. us is well worthy of the special notice it has always attracted; but the manner in which he alludes to the great and notable miracle which he was about to perform—the simple, unaffected, easy light in which he spoke of it, as if it were nothing more than the mere act of awaking a person out of sleep;—this is yet more remarkable, betokening, as it does, the calm and familiar consciousness of Divine power. In pursuance of the purpose which he had thus intimated, he returned to Bethany, accompanied by his disciples. Ere he had time to reach the village, the tidings

of his approach are carried to the bereaved sisters. Martha went out to meet him, but Mary "remained still in the house." After seeing Christ, and giving vent to the burst of grief which filled her heart afresh, at the sight of her brother's most valued "friend," she ran back to the house for Mary, saying, "the Master is come and calleth for thee." In obedience to this summons, Mary rose up hastily, and was followed by a large company of the neighbours to the place where Jesus was waiting for her, and from thence they walked on together to the grave, weeping as they went; for we read that "when Jesus saw Mary weeping, and the Jews also weeping which came with her, he groaned in the spirit and was troubled." The emotions of the *man* were beginning to swell in his bosom—for his was a true and tender heart. "Where (he asks) have ye laid *him*? They said unto him, Lord, come and see." Then follows the shortest and perhaps the most touching verse in

the whole Bible; for we are told that as soon as Jesus arrived at the spot where Lazarus was laid, the emotions which had been previously struggling within him, then broke loose, and tears gushed forth—"JESUS WEPT." Now, it is unnecessary to observe, that weeping is the natural expression of human weakness. Man is in his least manly mood, he is nearest the tenderness of childhood, or the softness of womanhood, when he is dissolved in tears. In this condition was the Saviour beheld on this occasion; and looking at him as he stood there with the stream of sorrow running down his cheeks, who could fail to recognize the Son of David—the child of man. But wait for a moment, and mark the change which is passing over that weeping countenance. His swimming eyes are turned to heaven; he is absorbed in prayer; and the band of mourners are standing by in breathless expectation, for the words that drop from him are the evident forerunners of some mighty work.

The stone which covered the mouth of the sepulchre had, at his own command, been rolled away, and there lay Lazarus, wrapped in his grave clothes, with his feet bound, and his hands stretched by his side. He had by this time been four days dead, and the process of decomposition had already begun. Jesus having concluded his prayer, drew near to the mouth of the sepulchre, and said with a loud voice—"Lazarus, come forth." Here, once more, is the authoritative style, and the imperative tone of Divinity. "Lazarus, come forth!" But will that call be heard? Will the cry of that weeping man "pierce the dull, cold ear of death?" Yes! the voice of him whose face is yet wet with tears, goes down to the dim realms of the departed. The command echoes through the silent land of spirits—"Lazarus, come forth." The disembodied soul hears it, and lo! that dumb figure stirs in the shroud; life creeps over these trembling limbs; the sleeper of the tomb

awakes; and "he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave clothes; and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, loose him, and let him go;" and Lazarus, wrapped in his long winding-sheet, ascended from the shadows of the sepulchre; and stood on the land of living men again. This, perhaps, affords the most striking illustration of the point we have been discussing that we have yet adduced; and it is one in which the meaning is so plain and palpable, that no comment is required to bring out its force, or to show you how truly Christ proved himself on this occasion also to be "David's Son," and "David's Lord;" "the Child," and "the Mighty God;" "the Son," and "the everlasting Father."

Here then is the key to the Evangelic history—the principle that unravels, in a great degree, the apparent contradictions and difficulties of Scripture. He who understands aright the constitution of Christ's

person, will be well furthered in his preparation for understanding the Gospel; but he who does not comprehend this department of doctrine properly, has not yet reached the point of vision from whence a clear and harmonizing view can be obtained of "the truth as it is *in Jesus*;" for be assured, it is "in Jesus" that "the truth" of God is primarily and pre-eminently treasured. The Bible is, in fact, nothing else than a development of Christ; a written revelation of that great Living Epistle; an expansion, and an exposition of the Divine truths that are folded up in his Mediatorial person. And as the Bible is a development of Christ, so Christ is an embodiment of the Bible; He is the Word incarnate; the Wisdom of God in a Mystery; the Way, THE TRUTH, the Life. Learn, therefore, of Jesus, for in him dwelleth the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and in him are hid unsearchable riches of grace, and "*all* the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

From the doctrine which we have thus attempted to unfold, touching the constitution of the Redeemer's person, several practical lessons of great moment might be deduced. Considering the length, however, to which this discourse has already extended, our limits will only allow us to advert to one or two of the most prominent of these :—

1. First of all, we would observe that the doctrine of Christ's Divinity is to us of the last practical importance, because *upon it depends the efficacy of his atonement.* If Christ were not a Divine being, he could have made no expiation for sin, and hence those who deny the Godhead of Christ, find themselves, in consistency, obliged to abandon the idea of an atonement. The connection between the two points is so close, that an argument of one or two steps will be sufficient to explain it. The argument is this :—No mere creature can possess MERIT, that may be applied to expiate his own guilt, if he sins, or that

can be used vicariously to expiate the sins of another. If *man* were able to fulfil the law of God perfectly, he would yet be doing nothing more than his duty. When he has exerted himself to the utmost, tasked all his powers to their fullest extent, and spent his whole life without a single deviation, or a moment's intermission, in obeying the will, and accomplishing the service of God, he has only done what he ought; and has therefore nothing whereof to boast—nothing that partakes of the character of merit. Merit consists in doing more than duty requires; for there can be no merit in rendering to God what he is justly entitled to demand, and what, if not rendered, must leave us in his debt, and subject us to the penalties of disobedience. Hence, we observe further, that even *an Angel* cannot merit. These glorious creatures are "not their own" any more than we are. Their time, their energies, their magnificent capacities are God's, and were bestowed for the sole purpose of being

employed in his service. All, therefore, that they can do, the utmost efforts they can put forth, are needed for the fulfilment of their own work. If they had any portion of time which belonged to themselves, if they had any reserved stock of power which they had not received, *then*, by laying out that time and that strength in voluntary and extraordinary labours, they might come to acquire a fund of merit, which might be used either for their own advancement, or applied to supplement the deficiencies of others. But we know that this is not the case. We know that all the energy and activity they can command are already staked, and distinctly required for the performance of their own duties. We are consequently warranted to affirm with the fullest confidence, that no mere creature, however exalted, can possess merit—can have any thing to spare, if we may so speak, beyond what he is bound to render for himself. There was only one being in the universe that *could* have merit, and

that was Christ. He was not required by any moral obligation whatever to become man, and in that capacity to fulfil his own law. Hence every thing he did was meritorious. In submitting to be made under the law, and in consenting to fulfil its demands, and to suffer its penalties, he did what *he was not bound to do;* and hence the labours of his life, and the sufferings of his death, *were all meritorious.* This it is that constitutes what the Scriptures term the "righteousness" of Christ, which is the ground of the believer's justification—the basis of his acceptance with God. If Christ, therefore, were not a Divine being, our faith would be vain, and we should still be in our sins, with no hope of redemption, save in ourselves. And the man who takes the responsibility of his salvation upon himself, would need to ponder well that pungent question,—"Can thy heart endure, or can thy hands be strong, in the day that I will deal with thee?"

See, then, that you appreciate aright this

great vital doctrine—the Divinity of our Lord. It is the foundation of the whole Christian system. Without it there is no mediation, and no atonement; and the redemption of the soul, though inconceivably precious, ceaseth for ever. Take it away and the hope of man is gone; for, apart from it, there is no spot in the wide ocean of human thought on which faith can rest the sole of her foot; "there is no other name given under Heaven among men whereby we can be saved, except the name of the Lord Jesus;" and if the name of the Lord Jesus were nothing more than the name of a creature, to trust in it were folly, and worse than folly—it were "an iniquity to be punished by the judge." But no, blessed be God—it is "a name that is above every name"—a name to which every knee shall bow, and which every tongue shall be compelled, sooner or later, to confess. Oh! that we were all persuaded and enabled to rest upon it with believing reliance, and in a spirit of humble, thankful, personal

appropriation, to say with the doubting but convinced disciple—"My Lord and my God."

2. Another practical lesson to be derived from this subject, arises from the consideration of Christ's Person *regarded as an object of divine worship*. He was God, but "God manifest in the flesh;" and such an incarnate manifestation of the Godhead was made for this, among other reasons, that, constituted as human nature now is, it is doubtful whether we could form any conception of the Divine Being at all, except as revealed through a mediator that was also human. One of the most fatal effects of the fall consists in its depriving us of the power of discerning the essential spirituality of the Supreme being. Our views are naturally carnal; our minds are incapable of comprehending what is purely spiritual; and hence there is every reason to believe that without some visible embodiment, some corporeal representation of the Divinity, the race of man would never

be able to realise the idea of God. Hence Christ is called the "*Image* of the invisible God"—"the brightness of his glory, and the express *image* of his person." And the principle which we have thus ventured to indicate seems to derive the most direct confirmation from the language of our Lord himself, when he says—"no man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father,—He hath revealed him." And in order that this revelation should be fully made, it was not merely necessary that Christ should enter into our minds by his Spirit, but that he should, as it were, enter into our bodies too; clothe himself with our nature—take possession of our entire being, that through the concurrent operations of body and soul, he might picture forth to our view the real character and perfections of the Godhead. Let us, therefore, not be afraid to regard and worship Christ as God, because he is also man; for, in point of fact, we can form no distinct notion of the Deity, except

through the medium of symbols. From the very constitution of our nature we cannot think of any object, save in connection, more or less, with some external embodiment. This is true of mankind as a race. It is especially true of that portion of them who are in a low state of moral and spiritual culture, who are therefore more directly under the influence of their senses, and whose thoughts are all tinctured with materialism; clogged with the clay in which their souls are enveloped, and with the tangible objects by which they are here environed. In evident recognition of this fact, God himself established in the ancient Church a system of typical worship. Although he forbade their fabricating any image of him, and punished them severely when they ventured to do so, yet he revealed himself to them by visible appearances, spoke to them by an audible voice, and manifested his presence amongst them in a way that appealed to their senses, as well as to their souls. The reason why

he prohibited the fabrication of images was that no likeness could be made of him by *human skill*, except such as was defective, and, therefore, fitted to degrade and misrepresent him. The low, unspiritual, sensual mind of heathenism was accustomed to delineate his nature by symbols taken from base creatures, and from barbarous men. Being "vain in their imaginations," and having their "foolish hearts darkened, they turned the glory of the incorruptible God into images made like unto corruptible men, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." The highest of the heathen gods were but deified savages; beings deformed by the worst passions of humanity, and, therefore, most gross and revolting representations of the pure and perfect One. Seeing, then, that the gods of the nations were of such a kind, and, what is more, seeing that the "world by wisdom knew not God," and, therefore, knew not how God should be represented, he found it necessary to interfere for the purpose of

preventing men from attempting to fashion any external likeness or similitude of him. The image through which he intended to make himself known to the world, and the only image that suitably represented him, was that of his Son, who is accordingly called, as we have seen, "the *express* image of his person." To worship God through Christ, therefore—to conceive of him in the form and manner in which Christ personates him, is just to worship him, and to conceive of him in the way which God commands. But, then, in order to be sure that we entertain right views of what God is, we must be sure that we entertain right views of his chosen Representative. To dissociate the human nature of Christ from the Divine, as is done by the Church of Rome, and to invest him in our minds with human attributes, principally, or exclusively, is to be guilty of idolatry; for then we worship the "Man Christ Jesus," instead of "Christ Jesus the Lord." And, on the other hand, to dissociate the Divine nature from

the human, as is done by the followers of Arius and Socinus, and to conceive of God apart from Christ, and from the practical revelation that Christ has given of him in his life and character, is, at the very least, to run the risk of forming a wrong ideal of the object of worship, and to lapse into a species of intellectual idolatry; the direct opposite, indeed, of that which prevails in the Church of Rome, but agreeing with it in this essential respect, that it is a worshipping, not of the God of whom Christ is the Image and Representative, but of another being—the offspring of our own fancy. For, as we have already said, we must have some ideal type—some definite symbol of God in our minds, and if we refuse to take the type and symbol with which God himself has furnished us, then we must think of him by some other; and to think of him by any symbol different from that which he himself has set before us, is to think of him wrongly, and to worship him idolatrously.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not forget the definition that Jesus gave of sound worship, when he said that "God is a spirit," and that they who would worship him aright, "must worship him in spirit, and truth." It *is* a spiritual being that we are to worship, and it *is* spiritual worship that we are to render to him; but then this spiritual being is brought before us, his essence and his attributes are exhibited to our view, in and by Christ. Not by the Divine nature of Christ alone, nor yet by the human nature of Christ alone, but by the united action of both in his one Person, and by the representation which they combinedly give us of the real character of the Supreme. If this reasoning be correct, the intellectual Unitarian may be as great an idolater as the sensual Romanist; the former may be worshipping a false god as well as the latter; and, despite of all his real or affected dread of idolatry, he is drawn or driven into that sin by the very means through which he seeks to escape from it,

namely, by refusing to recognise the Divinity of Christ. Of all the artifices of Satan, this is one of the most skilful; but then Satan knows his men; he catches the cunning in their own craftiness; the subtle in their own subtlety; the ingenious in the fine net-work of their own ingenuity.

But ye who prize the Scripture doctrine regarding the Person of Christ—be not ye, we again repeat, afraid to worship him as God, because he is also man. Remember his own saying, that "all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father, and he that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father." If the Son is to be honoured equally with the Father, there can be no danger in your giving the whole homage of your hearts unto him that loved you and gave himself for you. Instead of fearing to rely upon him too much, let it be your sorrow that you are disposed to rely upon him so little. And if it be true, on the other hand, that "he who honoureth not the Son honoureth not

the Father," they have reason to expect but little favour at the hands of God, who refuse to do homage to Christ. They may seek to persuade themselves that their refusal proceeds from a regard to the Father's supremacy, and from a desire to maintain the Father's glory, but he will accept of no honour that is designedly withheld from his Son. On the contrary, he looks upon those who disown his Divine Compeer, as persons who are disaffected towards himself; for if they "loved him that begat, they would also love him that is begotten of him." "Believe me (says Christ) I am in the Father, and the Father in me;" and the man that believeth not this, but strives to separate between the Son and the Father, and to alienate his worship from the one on the plea of reserving it exclusively for the other—such a man dishonours equally the Father and the Son.

3. Allow me, in the last place, to press upon *your practical consideration* the

question proposed in the text, "What think *ye* of Christ? That you entertain correct views in reference to the constitution of His Person, I have no doubt, because the heresies that exist elsewhere on that subject are but little known in the land from whence the most, if not the whole of us, have come. Whether it is owing to the superior advantages, educational and religious, which the people of Scotland have for generations enjoyed, or not, certain it is, that Unitarianism has never been able to obtain the smallest footing among them. Despite of their proverbial proneness to discussion and speculation, they have adhered stedfastly, and all but unanimously, to the orthodox sentiments on this subject; and we have therefore every reason to take it for granted that you are prepared to answer the question before us soundly and satisfactorily, so far at least as its doctrinal import is concerned. But I need not remind you that mere orthodoxy, however essential,

will not of itself secure your salvation. Something more than a sound creed is necessary to constitute a sound Christian. Ere you can be the latter, Christ must both be revealed *to* you and "revealed *in* you."* Remember that he himself said to Peter, when he confessed that he was the Christ the Son of the living God,—"flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven." † Remember, also, his statement on another occasion, "no man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."‡ Comparing these two passages together, we find that as the Son reveals the Father to the souls of men, so the Father, in like manner, reveals the Son. And if it be asked how this revelation is made, the Apostle Paul furnishes the answer when he declares, that no man can say that Jesus is Lord "*but by the*

* Gal. i. 16.

† Matthew xvi. 17. ‡ Matthew xi. 27.

Holy Ghost."* Nor is it by the mere communication of light—by a simple, objective exhibition of Christ to the mind that the Holy Ghost makes known his real character. We must, in fact, undergo a subjective change; we must pass through a renovating process; our faculties must be purged and purified by Divine Grace, before we can be in a state to perceive clearly and fully the glory of the God-Man. And hence the Apostle John tells us that "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, *is* born of God"† and reiterating the same truth with still stronger emphasis he says, "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God *dwelleth in him* and *he in God*,"‡ or in other words, a right apprehension of Christ is at once the result and evidence of regeneration. The truth which is here so distinctly set forth is of great significance and importance; and we therefore beg you to mark it well. Should

---

* 1 Corinthians xxii. 3. † 1 John v. 1. ‡ 1 John iv, 15.

there by possibility be any one present who has been brought to embrace Unitarian views, and who is ready to affirm that he has done so from examination and conviction, we would commend these statements of the divine word to his special attention. Has he sought for light from above? Has he in the course of his inquiries prayed that the Lord would create a clean heart and renew a right spirit within him, that he might thus, through a process of moral preparation, be brought into the proper position for apprehending the great mystery of godliness—God manifest in the flesh? If "no man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost," may not the reason of his failure be traced to the fact of his not looking for the aid of the Holy Ghost, because he does not believe in its personal existence? One thing is very plain, he has not used the means which the scriptures themselves point out for ascertaining the truth of another scripture doctrine; and if he is yet in the dark regarding that

doctrine, may it not be because he refuses to seek "light in God's light"—because instead of following "the mind of the Spirit" he has been following "the spirit of his own mind?" He has been depending upon himself—"upon flesh and blood"—to find out what Christ declares flesh and blood cannot reveal, but the Father which is in heaven. It is therefore no wonder that the doctrine of Christs' Divinity should be to him "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence."

And with regard to you, brethren, by whom the doctrine of the text is professedly held, may we urge you to consider whether your belief in it is a matter of mere indolent persuasion, or the result of well-grounded conviction. Can you give a reason for the faith that is in you? Can you, like the primitive disciples, prove from the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ? If so, it is well; but it is better still, yea, best of all, if you have the evidence of this truth in yourselves, and can say, with the

great Apostle of the Gentiles, in the words already quoted, "It pleased God to reveal his Son *in* me;" for such an inward display of Christ is the spring of conversion and the means of progressive sanctification. It is by "seeing" him in this manner that we are lead "to believe" upon him.* Faith is founded not on a mere vague notion, but on a distinct perception of the person and character of the Redeemer; and it is when the eyes of the understanding are opened, and when we are enabled to behold him in his true likeness, that "we look unto him" so as to "be saved." And, on the other hand, it is because we have no real, or, at least, no right apprehension of him, that we continue indifferent about him. The prophet Isaiah tells us, that, to the unbelieving world, he is as "a root out of a dry ground, having no form nor comeliness, and no beauty why they should desire him." But when the Spirit begins to

---

* John vi. 40.

reveal him, and when he proceeds, in the day of conversion, to "manifest himself" as he does "not to the world," then it is that we obtain something like a close and clear view of him—such a view as leads us to renounce our previous misconceptions and prejudices regarding him, and to take him as "all our salvation and all our desire."

Of the way in which he is thus brought forth to the sight of the soul, we have a very striking example in the case of the woman of Samaria. When he first addressed her, she took him to be an ordinary man; and, from the appearance he presented, as he lay wearied and travel-stained by the side of the well, she very probably regarded him as a poor and insignificant man. The manner in which she treated his request for a drink of water—the want of common civility by which her conduct was marked, seems to indicate this; for, instead of complying with his wish at once, and as a matter of course,

she turned round upon him with the rude and uncourteous question—"How dost thou, being a Jew, ask a drink of water of me, which am a woman of Samaria, for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans?" Despite of her rudness, however, he entered into friendly conversation with her, and told her of the living water which he had at his disposal, and of which he was willing to give her, not a draught only, but a whole wellspring, if she asked him for it. As he proceeded in his discourse, she seemed to feel, like his fellow-townsmen of Nazareth, when they "marvelled at the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth;" or like those whom the Pharisees sent to apprehend him, and who excused themselves for not bringing him, by saying, "Never man spake like this man." Looking at him more closely as she listened to his inspired words, she began to see him in quite a different light from that in which he at first appeared; and hence, unable to conceal the impression which

his spirit and his speech were making upon her, she now addressed him in terms of great respect, saying, "*Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet.*" This was an important step in advance. From supposing him to be a common Jew, and one who was scarcely worthy of being served with a drink of water, she was led on by degrees to form a higher and yet higher idea of him, so that at length she came to the conclusion that he was nothing less than a prophet—the holiest and most exalted of all human characters. But the process of illumination, though thus advancing, was not yet completed; and accordingly our Lord continued the conference, working upon her mind still more effectually by his word and Spirit, until at last she began to discern some glimpses of his Divine glory raying out from him, and casting into the shade even the prophetical honours with which she had previously invested him. The *Man* was becoming transfigured, and gradually assuming an aspect that bespoke the

Presence of something more than human. As if the thought had suggested itself to her mind, she threw out a hint about the Messiah, to which he immediately replied, "*I* that speak unto thee *am He*." On hearing this she left her water-pot behind her, and ran to the village, and said, "Come see a man that told me all things that ever I did, *is not this the Christ?*" Now, indeed, the process *was* completed; the revelation was fully made; the Messiah was beheld in the brightness of his glory; and this woman, dark and wicked though she was before she came that day to the well, left it not only convinced, but *converted*, by the view which Christ gave her both of His character and of her own!

And as a real, spiritual sight of Christ is the spring of conversion, so it is also, as we have said, the means of *sanctification*. The believer, "beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, is changed into the same image, from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord." The clearer we see him,

the closer does the likeness become. In this world, however, we can only behold the Divine Model through "a glass darkly," and therefore the moral assimilation, though gradually increasing, continues more or less incomplete to the last. But when the veil of sense is withdrawn, and the law of darkness and of death ceases to operate, "we shall be" altogether "like him"—why?—"for we shall *see* him *as He is.*" The resemblance here will be imperfect at the best, because of the dimness of our light, and the distance at which we too often keep from the great Object of Faith; but the believer shall one day shut his eyes on this cloudy scene, and open them in heaven, and then, but not before then, he shall "be satisfied when he awakes with his likeness."—*Amen.*

J. C. BECKET, PRINTER.

ecome. In
nly behold
ss darkly,"
ion, though
s more or
when the
the law of
o operate,
e him"—
s *He is.*"
perfect at
ss of our
n we too
f Faith;
his eyes
them in
then, he
kes with